

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-2026/2dn
MES:wlj:rs

May 1, 2009

Senator Sullivan:

Following a conversation I had with Greg Hubbard of Broydrick and Associates and an attorney from Quarles & Brady, I've prepared this /2 version of the draft. During the drafting process, however, a number of other things occurred to me, not all of which I've been able to address in this version of the bill.

Although the new instructions contain a public hearing process and evaluation by the joint review board, the /1 never explicitly stated that because the distressed TID can't pay off its debt, the city wants another TID in the city to share its increments. I've made this more explicit. Is this OK?

The draft states that the sharing of increments occurs under sub. (6) (d), (dm), (e), or (f), but all of those paragraphs are somewhat limited in terms of where the donor and donee TIDs are located. Are these cross-references sufficient? I believe that par. (d) applies only in Kenosha, and par. (dm) applies only to cities specified in sub. (6) (dm) 3. Paragraph (e) is more general, but still somewhat limited, and par. (f) is even more limited and is inconsistent with sub. (4e) (b) 2. The /2 version of the bill does not require joint review board approval if a financial report is submitted, whereas s. 66.1105 (6) (f) 1. b. requires joint review board approval. How would you like to resolve this conflict?

Marc E. Shovers
Managing Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-0129
E-mail: marc.shovers@legis.wisconsin.gov